



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

translations of classical authors will need stimulating studies of authors and of literary types to accompany their reading of the texts; without intending to be ungrateful for Mr. Loeb's excellent versions of both Decharme and Legrand, we should welcome independent studies of authors and types by English and American scholars; scholarship in this country and in England would profit if it were moved to prepare critical essays in which a sense of perspective and the graces of literary style are indispensable.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Latin Sentence Connection.* By CLARENCE W. MENDELL, PH.D.  
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917. Pp. x+214. \$1.50 net.

In the preface Dr. Mendell describes his work as "an attempt to discover a more fundamental standpoint for the consideration of sentence relations, and to do away with the somewhat artificial distinction between co-ordinate and subordinate by means of a more thorough understanding of the nature and origin of each." His first step is an analysis of the psychological processes which underlie the formation of sentences and their connection with one another. Sentences, he concludes, are never isolated units; adjacent sentences are always related in thought. The mere fact of juxtaposition shows relation, but the quality of the relation must somehow be conveyed to the mind of the hearer or reader if language is to be an adequate means of expressing thought. This treatise is a study of the means used by Latin writers to define sentence relations. It is based on an examination of Tacitus, Cato, Sallust, and the younger Pliny entire, of 300 pages each of Cicero and Seneca, of three books of Caesar, three of Livy, four of Quintilian, and four lives of Suetonius, besides many examples drawn from casual reading. The wide range of the author's material adds greatly to the value of his conclusions.

Dr. Mendell's analysis discovers three main elements in the expression of thought-relations—repetition, change, and incompleteness. Of these, the first two can be used only in the second of two adjacent sentences, the third in either. Repetition, the simplest and most natural means of expressing sentence relation, is discussed first. It consists in "the repetition in the second sentence of any element of the first, the element repeated being the bond which unites the two and defines their relation." The repetition may be semantic or morphological or, as the author prefers to state it, there may be repetition of content or repetition of function. The former is a simple example of the working of the laws of associative thinking. An idea from one sentence becomes the starting-point of the next. The sentence relation defined by repetition of content is, in general terms, logical subsequence.

The second sentence may merely add an item to the first; it may be explanatory; or it may express the result of the first. The relation is sometimes defined more precisely by the use of a conjunction. *Et*, *que*, and *atque* appear in sentences of the first type; *nam* and *enim* often mark the explanatory second sentence; *igitur*, *itaque*, *ergo*, and *quare* indicate result. *Autem* and *vero* with resumptive force are also sometimes used in connection with repetition of content. But the conjunctions, Dr. Mendell believes, have been introduced merely to add precision and emphasis to a relation already expressed. They are purely supplementary "until, by familiarity, they acquire the force which enables them to express a relation originally conveyed by more fundamental means." Repetition of content means repetition of an idea; functional repetition means repetition of construction, parallelism of structure. The usage is rhetorical in effect. Indeed, it lies at the basis of the rhetorical figure anaphora. The relation indicated is always that of logical coincidence. The sentences may be either parallel or contrasted. *Et* and *que*, with *aut* for negative sentences, are the only conjunctions used.

The next chapter deals briefly with the element of incompleteness when it appears in the second sentence. This retrospective use is unimportant, but must be understood for the better comprehension of the principle in its important field, the anticipatory. Conjunctions, demonstratives, relatives, comparatives, nouns, and verbs inherently relative in meaning occurring in the second sentence, all force the reader to look back for the complete meaning to the preceding. These are all examples of incompleteness of content. In none of these cases, however, does the element of incompleteness define the sentence relation. It merely calls attention to some other determining factor, usually repetition of content. Functional incompleteness may be illustrated by certain dependent uses of the subjunctive and by the relative tenses of the indicative, the pluperfect and future perfect. Except in the case of the pluperfect, whereby the second sentence is often marked as explanatory of the first, retrospective incompleteness of function does not define relation.

In the following chapter the author discusses the principle of change. Nearly every sentence shows decided change in content from the preceding. For this reason semantic change is effective as a means of defining sentence relation only when it is so abrupt as to suggest contrast and when it is confined to words which are either essentially or temporarily in the same category. The relation defined by semantic change is always the same, that of opposition or contrast. Functional change, change of mood and tense, has a wider range but is less efficient than semantic change. It is not in itself definite enough, as a rule, to express any precise sentence relation.

This completes the discussion of retrospective forms of connection. A detailed examination follows of the principle of incompleteness used as an

anticipatory connective element in the first sentence or clause. Most of the types noted in the examples of retrospective incompleteness may also be used with anticipatory force. The relation expressed is logical subordination, but in most sentences the precise definition of relation is determined by the meaning of the clause or by a conjunction. Sometimes, however, as in the use of comparatives or such words as *ceterus* and anticipatory imperatives, an adversative or concessive relation is directly suggested. Dr. Mendell finds that this study of anticipatory means of connection throws interesting light on the growth of subordinate clauses. The expression of relation in the first sentence is, he says, consciously rhetorical and a "natural step in the rhetorical development of subordination." The connective element, by marking its own clause as logically antecedent, "draws attention to the following clause as the more important, logically, of the two." "This accounts," in his opinion, "for the development of subordinate clauses to do much of the work which might have been carried by these incomplete clauses, resulting in the tendency to look upon the more fundamental and normal types as an exceptional usage and as substitutes for the types with subordinating conjunctions."

In the short chapter on parenthetical incompleteness the author makes a further contribution to the study of subordination. The discussion deals with verbs, chiefly those of saying, thinking, or asking, injected parenthetically into sentences, which without them are syntactically complete, but to which the injected verbs give a tone of earnestness, apology, or the like. Owing to the logical incompleteness of the inserted verbs, the adjacent clause eventually developed into a syntactically subordinate relation. Subordinating conjunctions and particles were later often added, but were originally purely supplementary, the fundamental connective element being the incompleteness of the inserted verbs.

Those who are interested in the study of sentence connection from the standpoint of scientific syntax will welcome Dr. Mendell's work as both sound and stimulating. His analysis should give an impetus to the further investigation of the origins of Latin conjunctive usage. His methods will prove useful, too, in the study and classification of Greek conjunctions and particles.

As a rule Dr. Mendell's illustrations are very apt. Exception may be taken to his interpretation of the quotation from Caesar's *Bellum Alexandrinum* on p. 43. It may be true, as Dr. Mendell asserts, that "the most prominent characteristic of Rhodes which it possesses in common with Syria and Cilicia is that of being a Roman dependency," but the fact does not seem to me patent enough to warrant his using this as an example of sentence connection by repetition of category. Rather it is the parallelism due to repetition of the ablative that serves as a unifying element here. The instances of repetition of category on pp. 53 f. and 78 f. are much more convincing.

The book is excellently prepared with few typographical errors. On p. 38, l. 25, *utatur* occurs for *utatur*; on p. 168, l. 6, *cognosite* for *cognoscite*. There are two annoying errors in cross-reference. In the footnote on p. 103 the reference is quite irrelevant; on p. 195, l. 17, reference is made to p. 148 for further discussion of certain interjected verbs of saying, but no trace of such discussion appears on p. 148 or indeed elsewhere in the book, so far as I can find.

GRACE HADLEY BILLINGS

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

---

*The Geography of Strabo.* With an English Translation by HORACE LEONARD JONES, based in part upon the unfinished version of JOHN ROBERT SITTLINGTON STERRETT. (The Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann; New York: Putnam. 8 vols. Vol. I, pp. xliii+531.

Mr. H. L. Jones was asked to complete the translation of Strabo left unfinished at the death of his teacher and colleague Professor Sterrett, who was originally chosen as translator by the editors. The introduction and the exhaustive bibliography are mainly the work of Professor Sterrett. In these the chief point of interest for the student of Strabo is the discussion of two controversial questions—the purpose of Strabo's travels and the place and date of the writing of the *Geography*. Professor Sterrett follows Pais in the contention that Strabo did not travel on his own account, but in the interest of persons of exalted rank, not Romans, as Niese believes, but probably Pythodoris, queen of Pontus. On the question of the date and place of the composition of the *Geography* the author again supports Pais against Niese in the thesis that Strabo wrote at Amasia—far from Rome—some time about 7 B.C., but revised his work about 18 A.D.

In the first two books contained in Volume I Mr. Jones, to preserve the unity of the work as a whole, has substituted a more literal version for the free rendering made by Professor Sterrett, although acknowledging his indebtedness to that eminent scholar for much of the diction and other elements of style. The remaining books will be the independent work of Mr. Jones. The translation is in clear, readable English—not over-technical—though sufficiently close to the original. The reader will feel particularly indebted to the translator for the intelligible renderings of the sometimes unfamiliar and obscure vocabulary of Strabo, the lucidity of the involved mathematical passages, and the much-needed explanatory footnotes and geometrical drawings. However, not to renounce entirely the privileges of a reviewer, I must mention a few passages in which Mr. Jones's translation is open to criticism.